

5	<b>Applicant:</b>	Flam	<b>Paper No.:</b> N/A
	<b>Application No:</b>	10/036,591	<b>Group Art Unit:</b> 2176
10	<b>Filed:</b>	11/7/01	<b>Examiner:</b> Robert M. Stevens Fax: 571-273-8300

15 Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## 20 Status of the prosecution

30 ... Applicant's amendments to the claims significantly change the scope of  
the claimed invention as a whole. As such, Applicant's arguments  
concerning the previous rejections of claims 1-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)  
have been rendered moot. (Office action of 11/8/2005, §5)

1

Crater et al., *Object-oriented programmable industrial controller with distributed interface architecture*, filed May 29, 1998 (hereinafter "Crater"). Applicant again requested an interview, which Examiner graciously granted. The interview was held on Feb. 6 with Examiners Bashore and Stevens. The basis for the interview was a written  
5 *Argument* which was faxed to Examiner Stevens on 2/3/2006. The *Argument* traversed the rejections. On 2/6/06, Applicant filed a response to the first Office action that included an expanded version of the *Argument*.

On 4/17/06, Examiner mailed a final Office action in which he again rejected all claims  
10 as obvious over Hirsch and Crater. In a *Response to Arguments* beginning at the bottom of page 7 of the final Office action of 4/17/06, Examiner indicated that the arguments made in the *Argument* were not supported by the claim language. In particular, Examiner indicated that "the body of the claim sets forth no structure or process for "performing a query" and that "since the body of the claim sets forth no structure or process for  
15 performing a query, the recited claim does not require an automatic performance of some action upon a query returning a record."

Upon receipt of the final rejection, Applicant's attorney telephoned Examiner to set up an interview to discuss claim amendments which would support the *Argument*. The  
20 interview was scheduled for May 3. On April 25, Applicant's attorney faxed Examiner a set of amended claims which Applicants' attorney desired to discuss on May 3. Examiner was forced to postpone the interview to a later date in May. When the interview finally took place, Examiner indicated that the amendment to claim 1 now supported the *Argument*, but that further work on the claims was needed to relate the claim term  
25 "window" to the rest of the claim and to leave no doubt that the claims were addressed to patentable subject matter.

Applicant is now amending his claims along the lines proposed in May. The amendments further leave no doubt that the claims are now addressed to patentable  
30 subject matter. Applicant has further taken the opportunity to generally clarify his claim language by making it clear that the fields specified in the graphical user interface are

present in a set of the records and further clearly distinguishing between claim elements that belong to the window in the graphical user interface and claim elements that belong to the record that contains the field that is modified when the record is returned by a query.

5

**Please amend the claims as follows:**